UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/596,753	06/15/2000	Michael D. Christensen	016295.0597 (DC-02236)	3254

23640 7590 05/02/2005	EXAMINER
BAKER BOTTS, LLP	GURSHMAN, GRIGORY
910 LOUISIANA	

| | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995 | 2132 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 March 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's amendment of claim 1 reflects " devices, each having a host bridge associated therewith for connecting with a host bus". This limitation is addressed in the rejections herein.

2.   Referring to claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20, Applicant argues that neither Rekeita nor Kondou, discloses a systems that involve more than a single host bridge. With respect to this argument examiner points out that two bridges are disclosed in Fig.1 of Rekeita (see host bridge and PCI bridge, which serves as a host bridge to PCI devices within block 44). Applicant further argues that PCI-to-PCI bridges do not meet the second host bridge. Examiner respectfully disagrees and points out that two host bridges are shown in Fig. 1 of Rekeita. Furthermore, these bridges are coupled to a bus. This arrangement is the same as recited in claim 1, for example the limitation "... devices, each having a host bridge associated therewith for connecting with a host bus" is met by two PCI bridges connected to PCI buses. Examiner states that the independent claims 1, 8 and 15, do not include any recitation pointing out the alleged differences between PCI buses of Rekeita and the host buses claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rekeita (U.S. Patent No. 6.189.063 B1) in view of Kondou (U.S. Patent No. 6.519.671 B1).

5.   Referring to the instant claims, Rekeita discloses a method and apparatus for intelligent configuration register access on a PCI to PCI bridge (see abstract).

Rekeita teaches an apparatus for intelligent configuration register access on a PCI to PCI bridge (38) are provided. A read to configuration information of a connected PCI device (30) is identified. It is then determined whether the connected PCI device (30) is one for which the read should be trapped. If the read should not be trapped, the read is passed on to the connected PCI device (30). If the read should be trapped, the type of PCI device is determined for the connected PCI device (30). Data is then returned representing the configuration information in a format appropriate for the type of PCI device. In one aspect, the configuration information comprises the subsystem ID and subsystem vendor ID of the PCI device (see abstract and Figs. 1 and 5).

6.   Referring to claims, the limitation "at least two installed bootable devices, each having a respective host bridge associated therewith for connecting with a host bus" is met by units 30, 22 and 38 in Fig. 1. The limitation "a computer readable medium storing identification data for each of the installed bootable devices" is met by unit 18 (in Fig. 1). While Rekeita teaches that the configuration information comprises the subsystem ID and subsystem vendor ID of the PCI device, he does not explicitly teach that host bridge identification data is stored on the computer readable medium.

Referring to the instant claims, Kondou teaches the application of the network bridges

(see Fig.2). Kondou teaches a register for storing the equipment ID of the bridge (see

column 12, lines 54-58). Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer system of Rekeita

comprising the host bridge with bootable devices and the computer readable medium by

storing on it the bridge identification data as taught in Kondou. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to modify the computer system comprising the host

bridge with bootable devices and the computer readable medium by storing on it the

bridge identification data as taught in Kondou for setting the portal (OWNER EUI

register) and configuration of the network (see Kondou, abstract and column 12, lines

54-58).

7.   Referring to claim 2, Rekeita teaches that installed bootable devices are PCI

devices (see Fig. 1, units 30).

8.   Referring to claims 3, 4 and 7, Rekeita teaches that identification data comprises

vendor ID and device ID (see abstract and Fig 4A).

9.   Referring to claim 5, BMC (unit 31 in Fig. 2 of Kondou) represents the bootable

device coupled to a bridge (51). BMC has RAM and ROM, which are parts of the BIOS.

BMC accesses the identification data of the bridge stored in portals (41 and 42).

10.   Referring to claims 6,12,13,16 and 20, with regard to the limitation " set up

routine operable to display the installed bootable devices", it is well known in the art to

use the routine for displaying the installed bootable devices. For example it is used in

Microsoft OS for displaying all of the external devices connected to the PC. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to display the installed bootable

devices for monitoring the system.

11.   Referring to claim 8, 9, 10, 11, 15,17 and 18, the limitations "...host bridge

number is associated with one of a plurality of host bridges" and "creating an identifier

for each bootable device from the host bridge number and the identification data read

from each bootable device" are met by configuration information comprising the

subsystem ID and subsystem vendor ID of the PCI device (see Rekeita abstract and

Figs. 1 and 5).

12.   Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Rekeita (U.S. Patent No. 6.189.063 B1) in view of Kondou (U.S. Patent No.

6.519.671 B1) and further in view of Adamson (U.S. Patent No. 5.761.448).

13.   Referring to the instant claims, Rekeita and Kondou teach the creating the

identifier for each bootable device from the host bridge number and the identification

data of the bootable device. Rekeita and Kondou, however do not teach comparing the

bus number and the device number associated with each bootable device to the values

associated with the slot. Referring to the instant claims, Adamson teaches creating a

bus mapping table including a field identifying the physical bus numbers of each bus in

the computer system, a field identifying the logical bus number of each bus in said

computer system, and additional information such bus type (PCI peer, PCI bridge,

EISA, etc.), parent bus number, and parent bus slot number. Adamson also teaches

that during system start up, the current physical bus numbers assigned by the computer

system to the busses during system boot-up are compared to the physical bus numbers contained within the bus mapping table to generate a logical-to-physical map table for translating logical bus numbers to current physical bus numbers (see Fig.6 and column 3, lines 35-50). Therefore, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the computer system wherein the identifier is created for each bootable device from the host bridge number and the identification data of the bootable device of Rekeita and Kondou by comparing the bus number and device number with the slot value number as taught in Adamson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the computer system wherein the identifier is created for each bootable device from the host bridge number and the identification data of the bootable device by comparing the bus number and device number with the slot value number as taught in Adamson for generating the logical-to-physical map table for translating logical bus numbers to current physical bus numbers (see Adamson column 3, lines 45-50).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grigory Gurshman whose telephone number is (571)272-3803. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571)272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Grigory Gurshman
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

GG

GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100